<div align="center">**Remarks**</div>

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed June 18, 2009.

I.   **Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

Prior to the Office Action mailed June 18, 2009, Claims 1-3, 6, 8-13, 15-16, 18-21, and 23-28 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 20 and 23 were objected to for various informalities. Claims 1-3, 6, 8-13, 15-16, 18-21, and 23-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Amirisetty et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,152,090, hereafter Amirisetty).

II.   **Summary of Applicant's Amendments**

The present Reply amends Claims 20 and 23, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-3, 6, 8-13, 15-16, 18-21, and 23-28. Reconsideration of the Application, in view of the following comments, is respectfully requested.

III.   **Claim Objections**

In the Office Action mailed June 18, 2009, Claims 20 and 23 were objected to for various informalities. Claims 20 and 23 have been amended as shown above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV.   **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

In the Office Action mailed June 18, 2009, Claims 1-3, 6, 8-13, 15-16, 18-21, and 23-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Amirisetty (U.S. Patent No. 7,152,090).

Claim 1

Amirisetty discloses that the metadata-aware CCI adapter 102 may intercept an incoming high-level function call (input data object 108 A). Input data object 108 A may include a document, for example an XML document. In one embodiment, the document may be in a high-level dialect, for example a high-level XML dialect. Transformer 104 may then drive a sequence of transformations 202 on the input data object 108 A as per one or more metadata definitions of the function call. The sequence of transformations 202 may result in a secondary data object 108 B which may include an action flow 204 of connector-level invocations expressed in a flow language

- 7 -

and a list of connector-level CCI invocations 206 referenced by flow 204. (Column 13, lines 28-40).

Applicant respectfully submits that Amirisetty does not appear to disclose a protocol adapter as recited in Claim 1. In particular, Claim 1 recites a protocol adapter that intercepts the invoke request, converts the message format of the invoke request, and creates an initial message context including the invoke request, a placeholder for a response, and information about a transport.

Based on the above description it appears that, in Amirisetty, an adapter intercepts a request that includes a document, and then performs a series of actions on that document to create new objects. These new objects, however, do not appear to be an initial message context, as this feature is recited in Claim 1. Particularly, while in Claim 1 the initial message context includes the invoke request, a placeholder for a response, and information about a transport; in Amirisetty, the new objects appear to include actions, expressed in a flow language, and do not appear to include the invoke request or a placeholder for a response. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Amirisetty does not disclose a protocol adapter as recited in Claim 1.

Applicant further respectfully submits that Amirisetty does not disclose an interceptor as recited in Claim 1. In particular, Claim 1 recites an interceptor that receives the initial message context for the invoke request for the web service from said container driver, the initial message context including a plurality of parts each of which includes corresponding content, and modifies the content of one or more of the parts of the initial message context to produce modified message context for the web service, the modified message context including the same plurality of parts as the initial message context but with the content of one or more parts differing from the initial message context.

As described above, Amirisetty appears to disclose an adapter that can intercept requests and create new objects; which new objects may then be used to drive a series of invocations on the underlying connector, and wherein the series of invocations may then result in another set of new objects. However, Claim 1 recites an interceptor that receives the initial message context for the invoke request; and modifies the content of one or more of the parts of the initial message context. Applicant respectfully submits that, as disclosed in Amirisetty, the adapter therein does not appear to modify the existing objects, but instead appears to create new objects. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Amirisetty does not disclose an interceptor as recited in Claim 1.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

- 8 -

Claims 11 and 20

      The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 11 and 20 are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 2-3, 6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-16, 18-19, 21, and 23-28

      Claims 2-3, 6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-16, 18-19, 21, and 23-28 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1, 11, or 20. Claims 2-3, 6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-16, 18-19, 21, and 23-28 have not been addressed separately herein; however, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V.   **Request for Interview**

      In the event the above remarks fail to place the case in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests the opportunity to interview with the Examiner at his convenience, and prior to the issuance of a subsequent Office Action, to assist in expediting prosecution. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

VI. **Conclusion**

      In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

      The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

                                 Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 18, 2009   By: /Nathan L. Feld/

                                              Nathan L. Feld
                                            Reg. No. 59,725

Customer No. 80548
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800